The Public Schools of Jersey City

JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DISTRICT STRATEGIC PLAN
1995 - 2000

! 1997-98 ACTIVITIES!

ANNUAL REPORT OF PROGRESS for the School Year 1997-98

Dr. Richard A. DiPatri State District Superintendent of Schools

July, 1998

JERSEY CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION

Mr. Gregg Butterfield, Chairperson
Mrs. Willie Flood, Vice Chairperson
Ms. Sonia Araujo
Mr. Nicholas Fargo
Mrs. Suzanne Mack
Ms. Rosalinda Mayo
Mr. John Nagel
Mr. Timothy Stuckey, Sr.
Mr. Franklin L. Williams

Dr. Richard A. DiPatri
State District Superintendent of Schools

Dr. Deborah S. Alexander State Assistant Superintendent

Mr. Frank M. Sinatra Acting State Business Administrator

Dr. Dorothy Dallah Associate Superintendent--High School Division

Mr. Francis X. Dooley
Associate Superintendent--Division B

Dr. Grisel Lopez-Diaz Associate Superintendent--Curriculum & Instruction

Mr. John Pacifico
Associate Superintendent--Division A

Dr. Nicholas A. Duva Director--Research, Planning & Evaluation

JERSEY CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS DISTRICT STRATEGIC PLAN, 1995-2000

Annual Report of Progress

for the School Year 1997-98

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FORE'	EWORD	6
EVALU	UATION PROCEDURES	7
SUMM	MARY OF DISTRICT STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND BEHAVIOR INDICATORS	9
SUMM	MARY OF SCHOOL-BY-SCHOOL STUDENT PERFORMANCE AND BEHAVIOR INDICATORS	11
NARR	RATIVE DESCRIPTION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PLAN ACTIVITIES OVER THE SCHOOL YEAR	45
OBJE	CTIVE NO. 1: IMPROVE STUDENT PERFORMANCE	46
	Implementation of NJDOE Core Curriculum Content Standards 1.1.1 Extended Day and Saturday Programs 1.1.2 Educational Technology Support Initiatives a. District-Wide Technology Enhancements b. Snyder High School Technology Magnet 1.1.3 Enhanced District- and School-Level Planning a. District-Level Planning Activities b. School-Level Planning Activities 1.1.4 Classroom "Excel Grants" for Teachers 1.1.5 Standards-Based Assessment 1.1.6 Library/Media Support	46 47 47 49 50 50 51 51

	1.1.7 Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees	51
	a. Revision of 5-Year Curriculum Cycle	51
	b. Introduction of Curriculum Frameworks	52
	c. Plan for Implementation of World Languages	52
	d. Integration of Technology into Curriculum	52
	1.1.8 Special Education Initiatives	
	a. Special Education 3-Year Plan	
	b. Special Education Support	
1.2	Improvement of Lowest Performing Schools	53
	1.2.1 SIGNA Plans	53
	a. Fixed Components of Elementary School Plans	53
	b. Fixed Components of High School Plans	53
	c. EWT/HSPT Preparation Programs	53
	d. SIGNA Staff Training	54
	e. Elementary Promotional Policy	54
	f. High School Promotional Policy	54
	1.2.2 School Performance Targets	54
	1.2.3 Support by Administrative Staff	54
	a. Classroom Observations by Principals	
	b. School Visitations by Administrative/Supervisory Staff	55
	1.2.4 Staff Accountability	55
	1.2.5 Letters to Principals Regarding Performance	55
	1.2.6 Comprehensive School Assessment for SIGNA Schools	55
1.3	Professional Development	55
	1.3.1 Technology Training	55
	1.3.2 Training for Early Childhood Accreditation	55
	1.3.3 Special Education Staff Training	56
	1.3.4 Professional Development Schools	56
	1.3.5 Staff-Selected Training Opportunities	56

1.4	Expansion of Early Childhood Program	57
	1.4.1 Assignment of K-2 Teaching Assistants	57
	1.4.2 Full-Day Kindergarten Expansion	
	1.4.3 Expansion of Reading Recovery Program	57
	1.4.4 Increase Capacity of Facilities to Accommodate Expanded Programming	57
1.5	Parent/Family/Community Initiatives	
	1.5.1 Communications Plan	
	1.5.2 Expansion of School-Level Parent Involvement Projects	
	1.5.3 Liberty Science Center Program	
	1.5.4 District-Wide Parent Involvement Projects	59
OBJE	CTIVE NO. 2: IMPROVE STUDENT ATTENDANCE	59
2.1	Enhanced Student Support System	
	2.1.1 Individual School Student Attendance Targets	
	2.1.2 Interagency Task Force Activities	
	2.1.3 Student Referral System	60
2.2	Violence/Vandalism/Conflict Resolution Programs	60
2.3	Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program	61
OBJE	CTIVE NO. 3: REDUCE STUDENT DROPOUT RATE	61
3.1	Dropout Prevention Initiative	61
	3.1.1 Dropout Tracking System	
	3.1.2 Dropout Task Force	
	3.1.3 Alternative Education	
	3.1.4 School-to-Work Opportunities Program	

FOREWORD

This document presents the <u>Annual Report of Progress</u> on the 1997-98 revision of the Jersey City School District's <u>Strategic Plan, 1995-2000</u>. Included in this Report is a description of the implementation of our revised Plan over the school year, including progress made on activities designed to address our three district objectives of improved student performance, improved student attendance, and reduced student dropout rates. Per the NJDOE "Strategic Plan Oversight Model," a final summary of district and school-by-school student performance and behavior indicators for the 1997-98 school year is included.

It should be noted that revisions to our <u>Strategic Plan, 1995-2000</u> were made to establish a clear focus on attainment of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards, improve our lowest performing schools, increase staff accountability, provide new professional development opportunities, and emphasize and support school-based planning and evaluation activities. As well, expansion of our Early Childhood Program, parent/family/community initiatives, and a full range of attendance improvement and dropout prevention strategies were included in the revision and implemented over the 1997-98 school year.

The success of our Strategic Plan, at both the district and school levels, is measured at year end by progress made in attainment of district objectives in student performance, attendance and dropout rates, and individual school target performance scores in Reading, Mathematics, and Writing in grades 4, 8 and 11. Interim progress at the school level was measured by an ongoing process of data collection and analysis throughout the school year. Specific procedures which were carried out at both the elementary and high school levels, are described on page 7 of this Report.

Nicholas A. Duva, Ph.D. Director Research, Planning & Evaluation July, 1998

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

The success of our Strategic Plan at both the district and school levels is measured by year-end progress made in attainment of district objectives in student performance, attendance and dropout rates, and individual school target performance scores in Reading, Mathematics, and Writing in grades 4, 8, and 11.

Interim progress was measured by an ongoing process of data collection and analysis throughout the school year. To evaluate **student attendance** and **dropout rates** on an interim basis during the school year, monthly statistics in these areas were compiled and presented in our Interim Reports. To evaluate **academic performance**, specific procedures have been carried out at both the elementary and high school levels, as follows:

At the elementary level, this included, in addition to the MAT 7, mid-term and final examinations in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. These exams are aligned to skills which will ultimately be needed to pass the EWT. Ongoing portfolio assessment has been conducted, with each 4th grade student having his/her own portfolio. Also, unit and teacher-made tests were utilized, and student grades were posted on a revised report card format. At the 8th grade level, a "diagnostic" EWT was administered in the fall to all students. Results of this test were reported in our first Interim Report. As well, for the first time this same instrument was administered to all 7th grade students during February, 1998. These results were presented in our second Interim Report.

In addition to serving as an evaluative tool, results of these measures were used to help school personnel identify the needs of each student tested, and to include students in special remedial programs, as needed, during and after school and on Saturdays. Analysis of the data determined the types of instruction needed for students whose results indicated the need for instructional intervention. In addition, these data were used to help both school and district personnel identify curriculum strengths and needs, and prepare instructional plans leading to acquisition of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards.

At the high school level, in addition to the HSPT 11, a "diagnostic" HSPT was administered to 9th and 10th grade students, with the results used to schedule students into remedial programs, as needed, during and after school and on Saturdays. Also, district-wide final examinations were administered in grades 9-12 to assess course proficiencies and mastery of subject area content. This will continue to occur twice per year under the recently implemented Copernican Block Scheduling Plan.

Following the submission of this <u>Annual Report</u>, high school supervisors of Language Arts, Mathematics, Science & Social Studies, along with instructional staff at each of the schools, will be provided with HSPT data from both the fall and spring administrations. In the fall, a school-level analysis of these results will be conducted, followed by school-level meetings to discuss strengths, weaknesses and strategies to address identified needs. This information will also be shared with staff members from all disciplines, making the data useful across the full range of content areas.

However, it is not the intention of our district to concentrate exclusively on evaluation of 4th, 8th and 11th grade student performance. We are concerned with student performance at all grade levels. Although the NJDOE has indicated that they have phased out the requirement for standardized testing in grades other than 4, 8 and 11, we are still planning to continue our evaluation program during the "off-years" when State tests are not administered, implementing, instead of the MAT 7, a performance system linked to the Core Curriculum Content Standards. We intend to evaluate performance using our district-developed mid-term and final evaluations, portfolio assessment, unit and teacher-made tests, and other evaluation measures.

At the request of the NJDOE, several modifications have been made to our procedures for evaluating progress on the Strategic Plan, especially in areas regarding attendance and dropout statistics.

As part of Plan Objective No. 2, school-level baseline data have been identified for student attendance, and monthly attendance statistics have been compiled by school and were included in our Interim Reports. Year-end data is included in this Report and provides year-over-year comparison of progress in this area. Also in the area of attendance statistics, we have determined annual benchmarks for each school not yet reaching the 90 percent (3-year average) attendance target.

At the close of the 1997-98 school year, schools that have not yet met the 90 percent attendance targets include our special education schools, P.S. 31 and P.S. 32, our alternative school, The Academy, and four (4) of our high schools, Dickinson, Ferris, Lincoln and Snyder. Each of these schools will continue to have yearly attendance targets. In the area of Dropout Prevention (Objective No. 3), we had set our annual benchmark for 1997-98 at an expected dropout rate of 11 percent for students 16 years of age and older.

Finally, we intend to link the activities and findings of each school's Comprehensive School Assessment (CSA) to that school's yearly Operational Plans. We are currently developing a "consolidated" school-level planning document to accomplish this, as well as to facilitate school based needs assessment, performance analysis, and program planning activities. This document will be used for developing school-level plans for the 1999-2000 school year. However, further action in this area will be held in abeyance, pending adoption of the proposed Administrative Code for Standards and Assessment for Student Achievement. When approved, the appropriate section (NJAC 6A:6-44) should provide specific guidelines for the development of school-level plans. At that time, the district's format for these plans will be finalized.

Summary of District Student Performance and Behavior Indicators

For the 1997-98 school year, the district's performance in the benchmark grades of 4, 8 and 11 was measured by the MAT 7, EWT, and HSPT 11 in Reading, Writing and Mathematics. Four (4) of the nine (9) State testing areas showed improvement over 1996-97 results. The district met its benchmark for 1997-98 in three (3) of nine (9) of these areas.

Using the State Standard of 75 percent, the district has met or exceeded that level in grade 8 Reading and Mathematics, and in grade 4 Mathematics and Writing.

Specific results of our testing program follow:

On the MAT 7, our 4th grade students, district wide, surpassed State Standards in both Writing (81.2%) and Mathematics (78.7%), while Reading scores remained 5.6% below State Standard. On an individual school basis, 13 of 27 schools surpassed the State Standard in 4th grade Reading, compared to 14 of 28 schools in 1997. In 4th grade Writing, 19 of 27 schools surpassed the State Standard, compared to 22 of 28 schools in 1997. Finally, 18 of 27 schools surpassed the Standard in 4th grade Mathematics for 1998, as opposed to 20 of 28 schools in 1997. (For the current school year, P.S. 40 became a 5-8 Middle School, losing its 4th grade.)

On the EWT, our 8th grade students, district wide, surpassed State Standards in both Reading (82.1%) and Mathematics (75.2%). Writing scores are 6.3% below State Standard. On an individual basis, 19 of 24 schools surpassed the State Standard in 8th grade Reading for 1998, compared to 16 of 26 schools meeting the Standard in 1997. In 8th grade Writing, 9 of 24 schools surpassed the State Standard, compared to 15 of 26 schools in 1997. Thirteen (13) of twenty-four (24) schools surpassed the State Standard in Mathematics for 1998, compared to 12 of 26 schools in 1997. (For the current school year, P.S. 20 and P.S. 30 became Primary Schools, losing their 8th grades.)

Our 11th grade students have not yet achieved State Standards of 85% on a district-wide level. In Reading, the 1997-98 results show that 74.9% passed; in Mathematics, 69.8% passed; and, in Writing, 78.5% passed. This compares to the 1996-97 school year when 65.3% of students passed in Reading, 73.5% passed in Mathematics, and 75.7% passed in Writing.

Progress has been made in improving the district student attendance rate, with that rate going from 91.3% in 1997, to 91.4% in 1998. In addition, our dropout rate of 10.0% for 1998 shows a significant improvement from the 14.9% rate reported in 1997.

The following tables present district and school-by-school results for student performance, attendance, and dropout data.

DISTRICT

READING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	70.8	72.3	76.5	69.4	-7.1		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	77.4**	79.6**	81.4	82.1**	0.7		
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	67.2	65.3	71.9	74.9	3.0		

MATHEMATICS (%)*						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
4th Grade Test	81.4**	81.6**	82.7	78.7**	-4.0	
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	61.7	69.6	74.7	75.2**	0.5	
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	71.4	73.5	77.3	69.8	-7.5	

WRITING (%)*						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
4th Grade Test	83.1**	83.3**	85.0	81.2**	-3.8	
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	76.5**	75.0**	78.3	68.7	-9.6	
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	79.2	75.7	79.2	78.5	-0.7	

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
Attendance Rate	89.4	91.3	92.0	91.4	-0.6	
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	13.27	14.6	11.0	10.0	1.0	

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} Met State Standard

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

P.S. #3

READING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	72.8	63.8	72.8	76.0	3.2		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	83.9	85.7	85.0**	83.7	-1.3		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

MATHEMATICS (%)*						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
4th Grade Test	75.0	72.3	76.5	86.0	9.5	
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	71.4	69.0	74.3	69.8	-4.5	
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

WRITING (%)*						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
4th Grade Test	86.4	78.7	86.4	90.0	3.6	
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	91.1	85.4	85.0**	53.5	-31.5	
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
Attendance Rate	93.2	93.6	MSS	93.9	3.9	
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS	

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #5

READING(%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	58.9	69.0	74.3	79.2	4.9		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	91.7	90.6	85.0**	90.9	5.9		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	66.7	76.2	79.1	70.8	-8.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	77.1	87.5	85.0**	84.8	-0.2			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	82.4	85.7	85.0**	93.8	8.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	89.6	81.3	89.6	87.9	-1.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	93.4	94.4	MSS	95.0	5.0		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #6

READING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual								
4th Grade Test	80.0	72.6	80.0	80.6	0.6			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	85.2	93.6	85.0**	95.5	10.5			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	90.6	79.8	94.9	85.1	-9.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	58.9	87.3	85.0**	87.5	2.5			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	86.4	84.5	91.1	88.2	-2.9			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	91.1	94.7	85.0**	90.9	5.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	93.5	93.5	MSS	94.1	4.1		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	40.0	MSS	14.3	-4.3		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #8

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	88.8	69.2	88.8	87.3	-1.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	93.1	88.2	85.0**	89.6	4.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	84.0	82.0	84.0	91.3	7.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	86.2	89.4	85.0**	94.8	9.8			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	88.0	83.5	88.0	95.1	7.1		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	93.1	84.7	93.1	80.6	-12.5		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.9	92.3	MSS	93.0	3.0		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	2.9	0.0	MSS	14.3	-4.3		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #9

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	55.8	64.4	71.3	43.8	-27.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	47.6	65.0	71.7	85.8	14.1			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	77.1	81.4	82.6	89.6	7.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	39.5	35.6	52.1	53.6	1.5			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	76.7	82.8	83.5	68.8	-14.7		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	51.2	40.7	55.5	60.7	5.2		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	90.5	91.4	MSS	91.7	1.7		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	20.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	87.2	79.4	87.2	78.8	-8.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	84.5	92.3	85.0**	85.0	0.0			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	98.6	96.8	85.0**	97.0	12.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	82.8	82.0	83.0	92.3	9.3			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	98.6	92.1	85.0**	98.5	13.5		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	79.3	64.1	83.8	72.5	-11.3		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	93.6	93.2	MSS	93.9	3.9		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	3.7	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	50.0	68.1	73.7	52.3	-21.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	59.5	72.5	76.7	77.4	0.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	75.9	66.7	75.9	56.8	-19.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	27.6	57.5	66.7	61.3	-5.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual							
4th Grade Test	67.8	91.7	85.0**	78.6	-6.4		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	57.2	62.5	70.0	54.9	-15.1		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)						
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark	
Attendance Rate	89.4	92.0	MSS	90.7	0.7	
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	38.8	0.0	MSS	40.0	-30.0	

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	46.0	75.0	78.3	52.9	-25.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	63.3	59.6	68.1	67.5	-0.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Difference Benchmark Actual From Benchmark								
4th Grade Test	83.9	78.8	83.9	80.0	-3.9			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	46.7	38.3	53.9	67.5	13.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	72.6	92.3	85.0**	72.5	-12.5		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	73.4	46.8	73.4	40.0	-33.4		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	90.3	92.6	MSS	92.0	2.0		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	14.2	7.7	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	69.3	51.8	69.3	44.1	-25.2			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	65.3	50.0	65.3	76.9	11.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Difference Benchmark Actual from Benchmark								
4th Grade Test	70.4	56.6	70.4	41.4	-29.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	44.5	32.8	50.2	48.1	-2.1			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	66.7	61.4	74.0	54.5	-19.5		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	46.4	43.7	57.5	61.5	4.0		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	90.3	91.4	MSS	92.4	2.4		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	7.4	36.4	MSS	15.4	-5.4		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	68.8	90.9	85.0**	62.8	-22.2			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	89.7	89.3	85.0**	92.9	7.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Differe Benchmark Actual from Benchm								
4th Grade Test	90.7	97.0	85.0**	81.4	-3.6			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	72.4	89.2	85.0**	82.1	-2.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	90.7	97.0	85.0**	79.1	-5.9		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	93.1	85.7	85.0**	75.0	-10.0		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	92.4	93.1	MSS	94.3	4.3		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	33.3	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Differer Benchmark Actual from Benchm								
4th Grade Test	60.4	70.5	77.4	66.2	-11.2			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	81.5	80.2	81.8	85.1	3.3			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	80.2	87.7	85.0**	74.2	-10.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	72.9	69.1	74.4	72.3	-2.1			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	82.1	77.9	86.2	79.7	-6.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	92.5	79.0	93.9	85.0	-8.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	93.3	94.0	MSS	94.0	4.0		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	12.5	8.7	MSS	8.0	2.0		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual								
4th Grade Test	74.0	60.3	74.0	61.5	-12.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	87.0	85.4	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	88.9	55.9	88.9	80.2	-8.7			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	57.5	73.0	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	83.4	70.1	83.4	70.8	-12.6		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	66.0	70.8	N/A	N/A	N/A		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	92.3	93.7	MSS	92.4	2.4		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	5.5	25.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	46.3	48.2	60.5	46.4	-14.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	62.1	65.3	71.9	58.6	-13.3			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	46.8	63.5	81.9	68.8	-13.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	35.6	38.5	54.0	51.8	-2.2			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	53.7	63.5	70.7	65.3	-5.4		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	65.1	56.5	66.0	47.0	-19.0		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.1	93.1	MSS	91.6	1.6		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	10.5	0.0	MSS	8.3	1.7		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual								
4th Grade Test	67.5	75.2	78.5	61.5	-17.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	70.9	79.6	81.4	81.0	-0.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual								
4th Grade Test	83.8	93.1	85.0**	80.9	-4.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	68.8	84.6	84.7	83.0	-1.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	81.4	87.1	85.0**	81.7	-3.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	73.1	76.8	79.5	59.6	-19.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	92.0	92.0	MSS	93.1	3.1		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	18.5	20.0	MSS	50.0	-40.0		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #24

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	65.3	55.3	65.3	54.0	-11.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	84.0	86.2	85.0**	83.6	-1.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Dif Benchmark Actual Ber								
4th Grade Test	76.4	69.9	77.0	56.3	-20.7			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	66.1	80.2	81.8	82.1	0.3			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	83.4	74.8	83.4	64.4	-19.0		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	80.3	81.0	82.3	74.4	-7.9		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Dif Benchmark Actual Ber						
Attendance Rate	91.0	92.4	MSS	91.6	1.6		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	18.7	40.0	MSS	10.0	0.0		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Dir Benchmark Actual Be								
4th Grade Test	81.8	87.3	85.0**	86.3	1.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	91.9	91.9	85.0**	84.2	-0.8			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	90.5	94.9	85.0**	86.3	1.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	76.8	81.6	86.9	81.1	-5.8			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	95.3	99.2	85.0**	90.4	5.4		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	93.9	95.9	85.0**	71.3	-13.7		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	94.4	94.7	MSS	94.9	4.9		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	14.3	MSS	14.3	-4.3		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #27

					-			
READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	99.1	91.4	85.0**	83.9	-1.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	100.0	100.0	85.0**	95.9	10.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Dir Benchmark Actual Be								
4th Grade Test	98.1	98.9	85.0**	90.3	5.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	96.4	100.0	85.0**	94.5	9.5			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Differ Benchmark Actual from Benchmark								
4th Grade Test	100.0	97.8	85.0**	93.5	8.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	100.0	100.0	85.0**	100.0	15.0			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	94.0	94.9	MSS	94.8	4.8		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	8.3	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	77.9	78.0	80.3	75.9	-4.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	88.7	90.3	85.0**	85.7	0.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Di Benchmark Actual Be								
4th Grade Test	88.5	94.0	85.0**	87.5	2.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	87.1	87.9	85.0**	84.3	-0.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	85.3	91.0	85.0**	88.4	3.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	94.4	93.9	85.0**	78.6	-6.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	93.3	93.5	MSS	93.9	3.9		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	68.1	98.0	85.0**	67.3	-17.7			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Actual B								
4th Grade Test	68.1	100.0	85.0**	70.9	-14.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Differ Benchmark Actual fro Bench								
4th Grade Test	79.2	100.0	85.0**	81.8	-3.2			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.2	92.0	MSS	92.3	2.3		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	73.3	80.4	81.9	79.3	-2.6			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	90.4	74.5	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	89.3	88.2	85.0**	76.7	-8.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	61.5	66.0	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	91.1	88.2	85.0**	83.9	-1.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	90.3	78.7	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.7	92.7	MSS	93.3	3.3		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	6.2	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	95.0	94.6	85.0**	90.3	5.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	98.4	94.6	85.0**	95.2	10.2			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	96.7	94.6	85.0**	98.4	13.4			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.6	92.2	MSS	94.2	4.2		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	61.4	53.1	63.7	59.0	-4.7			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	78.3	72.0	78.3	79.6	1.3			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	75.3	69.8	75.3	62.2	-13.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	40.0	56.0	65.7	67.3	1.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	82.2	79.2	82.2	72.3	-9.9			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	91.7	88.0	85.0**	53.1	-31.9			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	90.7	92.0	MSS	92.6	2.6		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	14.2	20.0	MSS	20.0	-10.0		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	87.2	89.7	85.0**	98.8	13.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	81.7	96.1	85.0**	98.1	13.1			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	92.2	91.0	85.0**	100.0	15.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	64.8	57.7	67.7	96.3	28.6			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	97.5	95.5	85.0**	98.8	13.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	73.2	94.2	85.0**	89.1	4.1			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.5	91.8	MSS	91.6	1.6		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	20.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	70.6	78.9	80.9	80.6	-0.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	89.7	93.4	85.0**	93.8	8.8			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator 1995-96 1996-97 1997-98 1997-98 Benchmark Actual								
4th Grade Test	77.7	77.9	80.3	77.7	-2.6			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	85.0	98.7	85.0**	81.3	-3.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	80.4	78.1	80.4	84.5	4.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	87.8	97.4	85.0**	81.3	-3.7			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	94.2	94.9	MSS	94.9	4.9		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	35.9	44.9	73.8	44.0	-29.8			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	69.2	42.9	69.2	66.7	-2.5			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	59.8	60.3	76.3	70.2	-6.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	39.6	33.4	50.6	37.2	-13.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	53.8	59.0	67.7	60.7	-7.0		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	73.6	39.1	73.6	38.6	-35.0		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	90.0	91.0	MSS	89.7	-0.3		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	28.6	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	69.9	98.1	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	73.5	81.8	82.9	88.7	5.8			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	90.6	96.3	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	53.0	86.4	85.0**	83.0	-2.0			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	90.6	98.1	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	72.7	72.7	85.7	66.9	-18.8		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	92.2	92.7	MSS	91.7	1.7		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	0.0	50.0	MSS	0.0	MSS		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #41

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	57.9	65.1	71.7	65.7	-6.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	60.4	63.7	70.8	54.4	-16.4			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	67.8	77.8	80.2	85.7	5.5			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	37.0	43.8	57.5	45.5	-12.0			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	87.5	58.7	87.5	75.7	-11.8		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	35.0	41.1	55.8	39.1	-16.7		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	91.0	92.1	MSS	92.1	2.1		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	4.8	0.0	MSS	14.3	-4.3		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

P.S. #42

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	91.4	96.8	85.0**	80.0	-5.0			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	100.0	87.1	85.0**	94.3	9.3			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	95.7	93.5	85.0**	97.1	12.1			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	92.6	94.5	MSS	94.0	4.0		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

The Academy

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	42.1	61.8	69.5	68.3	-1.2			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	35.6	54.5	64.7	64.7	0.0			
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			

WRITING (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	45.4	61.8	69.5	57.6	-11.9		
H.S. Proficiency Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	85.6	92.3	89.3	91.4	2.1		
Dropout Rate ³ (16 year olds & over)	N/A	37.5	MSS	10.0	0.0		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Dropout rates for the elementary schools must be viewed with caution, as the number of 16 year olds in attendance is very low and may artificially inflate the dropout percentage.

Dickinson High School

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	71.7	71.2	75.8	81.5	5.7			

MATHEMATICS (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	83.0	85.3	85.0**	84.2	-0.8			

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	84.9	82.4	84.9	83.6	-1.3			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	81.3	84.0	84.3	84.7	0.4		
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	12.9	16.5	MSS	14.6	-4.6		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

Ferris High School

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	62.8	60.5	68.7	70.6	1.9			

MATHEMATICS (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	70.3	67.1	73.1	64.5	-8.6		

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	77.6	67.8	77.6	74.2	-3.4			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	84.7	89.1	87.3	88.9	1.6		
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	5.4	6.3	MSS	0.7	9.3		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

Lincoln High School

READING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	63.4	60.0	68.3	68.4	0.1			

MATHEMATICS (%)*							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	61.6	65.8	72.2	58.7	-13.5		

WRITING (%)*								
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark			
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A			
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	75.0	76.1	79.1	72.5	-6.6			

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)							
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark		
Attendance Rate	77.3	84.5	83.0	83.9	0.9		
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	20.7	23.2	MSS	15.8	-5.8		

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

McNair Academic High School

READING (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	100.0	100.0	85.0**	100.0	15.0

MATHEMATICS (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	100.0	98.9	85.0**	100.0	15.0

WRITING (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	100.0	100.0	85.0**	100.0	15.0

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
Attendance Rate	96.3	97.0	MSS	96.8	6.8
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	0.0	0.0	MSS	0.0	MSS

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

Snyder High School

READING (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	50.8	47.8	60.2	59.8	-0.4

MATHEMATICS (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	43.7	53.8	64.2	43.1	-21.1

WRITING (%)*					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
4th Grade Test	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Early Warning Test - Levels I & II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
H.S. Proficiency Test ¹	63.4	61.9	69.6	67.8	-1.8

STUDENT BEHAVIOR (%)					
Indicator	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98 Benchmark	1997-98 Actual	Difference from Benchmark
Attendance Rate	72.4	81.0	80.4	82.4	2.0
Dropout Rate (16 year olds & over)	23.8	17.3	MSS	9.2	0.8

^{*} Percentage of students scoring at or above the State-mandated level of proficiency (MLP)

^{**} The District Standard of 85% passing had been met in this area. However, it was expected that performance would remain above 85%.

Calculations of HSPT aggregate scores for 1997-98 account for student migration between fall and spring administrations, and are therefore not directly comparable to results reported in previous years

The following pages provide a description of progress made on each activity of our <u>Strategic Plan</u> over the past school year. Each activity was designed and included in our <u>Plan</u> to address one of our three (3) district objectives:

OBJECTIVE NO. 1: Improve Student Performance; OBJECTIVE NO. 2: Improve Student Attendance; and, OBJECTIVE NO. 3: Reduce Student Dropout Rate.

Each numbered activity and summary description of progress in this <u>Report</u> corresponds to the identical numbered activity in the <u>Strategic Plan</u>; therefore, they should be reviewed as companion documents.

ОВЈ	ECTIVE NO. 1: IMPROVE STUDENT PERFO	RMANCE
	ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.1	Implementation of NJDOE Core Curriculu	m Content Standards
	1.1.1 Extended Day and Saturday Programs	To support student mastery of the Core Curriculum Content Standards, extended day school sessions, providing innovative instructional activities as an extension of the developmental program, were conducted in all district schools for the first time ever during the 1997-98 school year. Additionally, a comprehensive Saturday enrichment program, "Super Saturdays," was held for students in
		grades 3-12. The Super Saturdays Program was conducted to provide a positive, supportive, and encouraging learning environment that helps students develop the self-confidence, self-esteem, and the independence needed to succeed in any academic or non-academic pursuit. This goal was accomplished through: (1) helping students develop an enthusiasm for learning and social maturity leading to success in their academic and personal lives; (2) helping students develop an eagerness to explore their world by expanding their horizons to investigate new learnings; and, (3) encouraging students to pursue new friendships and, through networking, develop a respect for different cultures, ideas, and beliefs.
		Super Saturdays consisted of over sixty different courses being offered at five district sites that were ten weeks in length and were implemented on Saturdays, January 17, 24, 31; February 7, 21, 28; and, March 7, 14, 21 and 28. Course offerings covered a broad spectrum of academic disciplines designed to stimulate creativity and provide hands-on experiential learning. Also, ESPA, EWT, and HSPT preparation courses-in Language Arts and mathematicswere offered. In all, over fifteen hundred students from both regular and special education participated during the school year.
		Over three hundred parent evaluation surveys were returned, and 99 percent of the parents gave Super Saturdays an overall rating of "excellent" or "good." One hundred percent of the parents felt that their children were "enthusiastic" or "very enthusiastic" about participating. One hundred percent said that the program should be offered again.
		Over fourteen hundred student evaluation surveys were returned, and 92 percent of the participating students gave Super Saturdays an overall rating of "excellent" or "good." Ninety-three percent of the students were "enthusiastic" or "very enthusiastic" about participating. Seventy-eight percent of the students participated in the free breakfast program. Eighty-six percent would attend the next time the program is offered, and 89 percent would recommend the program to their friends.
		The Super Saturdays Program was selected as the 2 nd Place Winner in the 13 th Annual <i>School Leader</i> Award competition of the New Jersey School Boards Association.

	ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.1.2	Educational Technology Support Initiatives	
	District-Wide Technology Enhancements	The NJDOE has approved the district's Educational Technology Plan (1996-2001). The Plan meets requirements for Distance Learning Network Aid, the Telecommunications Act of 1996-Universal Service Fund, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Our Plan is now listed on the Department's website on the Technology page under "New Jersey School Districts with Approved Technology Plans."
		To date, the following has been completed according to the implementation of the current year's Educational Technology Plan:
		! Wiring and Cabling – Wiring and cabling work was completed in all the schools. Building-wide Fast Ethernet networks were established with 100Base-T Switches.
		! DHS Print Production Facility – All items were purchased by bid or requisition. Delivery of all equipment is complete. Additional venting of equipment will occur in the summer and allow for new facility to open in September.
		! Graphing Calculators – All Graphing Calculators and Graphing Projection Units have been delivered to the High Schools.
		! Classroom Technology – All computers have been installed and secured in grades 3-8, including Special Education and Bilingual Classes.
		! Library Student Media and Library Management — Workstations have been installed in all schools with libraries.
		! Communication Arts – Workstations have been installed in all schools. Software was purchased by bid and is being shipped to the district.
		! Midi Music – Workstations have been installed in all schools. The district went out to bid for keyboard equipment, furniture, and software which is being shipped to the district.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
	! Science – Workstations have been installed in all schools. Laser Disk Players, software, and probe equipment have been delivered and will be utilized in September.
	(Cont'd.)
a. District-Wide Technology Enhancements (Cont'd.)	! Social Studies – Workstations have been installed in all schools.
	! Writing Labs – Workstations have been installed in all high schools.
	! CAD/CAM – Workstations have been installed in all high schools. Plotters, Scanners, and software have been delivered and will be utilized in September.
	! Business Ed Labs — Workstations installation is completed.
	! Snyder High Tech – One hundred workstations (2 per classroom for 50 rooms) were delivered, secured, and set up. Infrastructure work is completed. All workstations for CAD/CAM, Art, Music, Writing, Science, and Social Studies have been installed.
	! Internet Connectivity – High-Speed Internet Access (Frame Relay) is now available to 70% of our buildings with the rest of the buildings completed during the summer. Taking advantage of our K-8 classroom networks and our HS computer Labs, the building-wide area networks provide large-scale access to the Internet for our students.
	The district's connection to the Frame Relay cloud is being upgraded to a DS3 connection during the summer. Our Central Office Networking equipment is being upgraded to include network management, remote management, and remote access (Dial-In Internet Access from Home).
	Summer work will also include establishing ISDN connections to all of our sites as Frame Relay back- up and/or alternate delivery of service when Frame Relay connections reach their maximum burst rate.
	Each building-wide Fast Ethernet and existing Token Ring network is attached to a BAY Network's ASN Router with an ISDN and Frame Relay Port for District Wide Area Network (W.A.N.).

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
	! K-2 Computers – Computers were installed in 95% of K-2 classrooms. Additional computers were ordered and will be installed during the summer. Additional 100Base-T Switches will be ordered to complete connections to the building-wide network.
	(Cont'd.)
a. District-Wide Technology Enhancements (Cont'd.)	! Universal Service Fund – The Jersey City Public School District submitted three FORM 470 applications and one FORM 471 application for a total of \$3,324,396.15 in USF funds based upon 87% discount eligibility.
	! High School High Tech — Three hundred workstations (2 per classroom for 50 rooms at three HS) will be installed at Dickinson HS, Ferris HS, and Lincoln HS during this summer. Wiring and cabling work will begin during the summer.
	! Electrical Capacity Upgrades - The District has authorized electrical capacity upgrade design work to develop bid specs for 15 schools. Switch gears and panel boxes are being purchased and the labor is being put out to bid for completion of work in the summer.
	! Building Servers – The various networks in the building are being collapsed into a building-wide network including the installation of a new Novell Intranetware Compaq Server. Servers have been ordered and will be installed in the summer.
	! Library Management – The district's Library Media staff has received staff development on implementing the new Gateway Library Management Software application. All High Schools have submitted their shelf listing and/or card catalogs for retrospective conversion. Ninety percent of the elementary schools have shelf listing and/or card catalogs for retrospective conversion.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
b. Snyder High School Technology Magnet	Major design activities for the Media Arts High Tech Magnet at Snyder High School are complete, with construction document approval pending. Construction should begin in August, with completion scheduled by February 1, 1999. Curriculum has been written for the first semester, one of two teachers has been hired, and interviews are proceeding to hire the second teacher as well as two support staff. Sixty students have signed up for the September 1998 opening. Corporate partnerships have been established with companies such as Comcast Cable, Panasonic Corporation, Apple Computer, Merrill Lynch, Thirteen/WNET, New Jersey Network, and others, who are actively supporting the program and its activities.
1.1.3 Enhanced District- and School-Level Planning	
a. District-Level Planning Activities	The 1997 revision of the <u>District Strategic Plan, 1995-2000</u> , was completed and submitted to the NJDOE. On March 5, 1998, the district was notified by the NJDOE that it had completed its review of our Plan, and approved it for implementation. All supervisory and administrative staff received copies of the approved Plan and Interim Reports submitted in November and March. The present document represents our final reporting responsibility in this area for the 1997-98 school year. Effective design and implementation of our strategic planning activities, at both the district and school levels, resulted in an effective management system which established a context and focus for both new and ongoing educational initiatives throughout the school year.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
b. School-Level Planning Activities	School-level DEPA "Operational Plans" for 1998-99 were completed and submitted to the NJDOE along with the district's budget submission in February. At a subsequent meeting with the County Superintendent, school plans were approved for implementation for the coming school year.
	Target performance scores may be modified for 1998-99, based on the final standardized test scores for 1997-98.
	Over the course of the school year, R.P.E. provided ongoing technical assistance, research support, and direct involvement in the successful development of planning documents at all schools. Working with R.P.E., new Site Planning Teams established at P.S. #1 and at P.S. #32 developed appropriate objectives and viable plans which reflected the needs of their respective student populations.
	A revised school planning format and procedures are being developed for use in the 1999-00 school year planning cycle. This revised format will be a comprehensive planning document which will incorporate all planning activities at the school level and facilitate reporting requirements. R.P.E. attended SPT meetings to inform the development of this "consolidated" planning document by working directly with Team members. However, further action in this area will be held in abeyance, pending adoption of the proposed Administrative Code for Standards and Assessment for Student Achievement. When approved, the appropriate section (NJAC 6A:6-44) should provide specific guidelines for the development of school-level plans. At that time, the district's format for these plans will be finalized. It is expected that this document will meet all State and district planning requirements, and will include school-based needs assessment, performance analysis, and instructional program planning activities.
1.1.4 Classroom "Excel Grants" for Teachers	Over one hundred (100) Excel Classroom Grants were awarded to instructional staff members throughout the district for the 1997-98 school year. This initiative, designed to provide our instructional staff with the opportunity to implement special innovative projects in their classrooms, will ultimately lead to improved academic achievement and increased motivation of students. A requirement of all grants was that they be correlated with the New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standards and Cross Content/Workplace Readiness Standards. A full listing of grants awarded is available for review from the Office of the Associate Superintendent for Curriculum & Instruction. An overview of the program was developed and appears on the district's Internet web page. A networking "mini conference" for participating teachers took place on June 2.
1.1.5 Standards-Based Assessment	Fourth grade mid-terms were realigned to the ESPA, and were administered in January, 1998.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.1.6 Library/Media Support	For the 1997-98 school year, each school was allocated an additional \$10 per pupil to purchase library books and materials as needed and identified by individual building principals. To date, all planned purchases have been completed.
	A district-wide library management project has begun through the cooperation of the schools, the library media specialists, the library media supervisor, and the Educational Technology Department. There are four components of the implementation: software acquisition, equipment acquisition, training and retrospective conversion. The software has been installed and is operational. The equipment has been acquired through Abbott funds resulting in one management workstation per library, two student workstations per elementary school, and ten student workstations per high school. Three days of training for high school library media specialists has occurred, as has three days of training for 14 elementary school library media specialists, and three days of training for the remaining elementary school library media specialists. Retrospective conversion has gone out to bid and has been awarded. Retrospective conversion for high schools and all elementary schools is expected to be completed by August, 1998. Additional operational tasks to complete the project will take place in the summer and the month of September. It is anticipated that the district-wide implementation of Library Management will be completed by October, 1998.
1.1.7 Elementary and High School Curriculum Committees	
a. Revision of 5-Year Curriculum Cycle	All appropriate curricula were developed and/or revised for September, 1998 implementation.
b. Introduction of Curriculum Frameworks	Math curriculum frameworks were sent to every teacher. Math and science curriculum frameworks are used in curriculum and staff development activities. Staff training for integration of these frameworks will be ongoing.
c. Plan for Implementation of World Languages	The Elementary World Languages Program will be implemented in all elementary schools in grades 2 and 5 in September, 1998. Fifteen fully certified teachers have been hired, and staff development has been conducted. An elementary World Languages Curriculum that stresses communicative competence and knowledge of the cultures of Latin America and Spain will be implemented. Materials for the program include audio visual materials and encourage student interaction. Staff development for elementary principals and supervisors has taken place. The World Languages Task Force will continue to meet next year to make recommendations for program improvement.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
d. Integration of Technology into Curriculum	See section 1.1.2 a. Also, a Cross Content/Workplace Readiness Standards Implementation Plan was developed, and has been selected for recognition by the NJDOE.
1.1.8 Special Education Initiatives	
a. Special Education 3-Year Plan	Our comprehensive 3-year plan for the improvement of special education programs and services in curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, and parent participation has been developed and presented, in draft form, to the Jersey City Board of Education, parents, teachers and administrative staff. After review by all constituents, the Superintendent will finalize the plan. We anticipate implementation early in the 1998-99 school year.
b. Special Education Support	The additional \$1000 allocated to each special education classroom to purchase active learning materials to enhance instruction was expended as planned. A similar amount will be allocated to special education classrooms for 1998-99.

1.2 Improvement of Lowest Performing Schools

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.2.1 SIGNA Plans	A total of twenty schools were identified as the lowest performing schools in the district per standards defined by NJAC 6:19-2.3. These schools include nine "SIGNA I" elementary schools targeted for failing three or more consecutive years, seven "SIGNA II" elementary schools, targeted for specific area needs, and four high schools.
	Each SIGNA school developed and submitted improvement plans to their Division Associate Superintendent. SIGNA I schools and each of the four high schools formally presented their plans to the Superintendent and Senior Staff for final review, approval, and implementation. To date, all SIGNA I elementary schools, and all high schools, have implemented their plans.
a. Fixed Components of Elementary School Plans	SIGNA training for grades 7 and 8 has been completed. Training for grades 3 and 4 and special education teachers began in January and ended in March.
	At-risk students in grades 4 and 8 have been identified, parents have been notified, and contracts for attendance at remedial programs have been signed at meetings with guidance staff.
b. Fixed Components of High School Plans	HSPT preparation programs were held on Saturdays from the opening of school to the administration of the test. The Super Saturdays Program began in January. In addition to the Super Saturdays Program held at McNair Academic High School, each school had an HSPT Preparation Program which began after the results of the fall HSPT administration became available. A Sunday Program was held at St. Peter's College for students from F.H.S., D.H.S., and L.H.S., and a Wednesday and Saturday Program was held at Jersey City State College for S.H.S. students. High school science, social studies, and special education teachers were trained April through June.
	Guidance counselors have secured signed contracts of agreement for participation in remedial HSPT programs.
c. EWT/HSPT Preparation Programs	EWT and HSPT Preparation Programs were established for after school and Saturdays to provide a small group instructional setting to students identified as at risk of failing on standardized tests.
	At the 8th grade level, a "diagnostic" EWT was administered in the fall. Results of that administration were presented in our first Interim Report and were used to plan appropriate remedial activities. As well,
	(Cont'd.)

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
c. EWT/HSPT Preparation Programs (Cont'd.)	the "diagnostic" EWT was administered to our grade 7 students. Results were presented in our March, 1998, second Interim Report.
	At the high school level, HSPT Preparation Programs were held during the weeks prior to the administration of the fall test. The district will continue, during the summer of 1998, with ESPA, EWT and HSPT Institutes.
d. SIGNA Staff Training	A training schedule was established by Dr. E. Susanne Richert of the Global Training Institute for 3rd, 4th, 7th, and 8th grade teachers in SIGNA I and SIGNA II elementary schools. All scheduled training and coaching sessions occurred as planned. Similar training occurred for high school teachers of science, social studies, and special education—April through June of this school year. The full training program is to be completed in the fall.
	The cadre of district pool substitutes was increased by thirty-five, and all were trained and assigned to fill in for regular education teachers attending SIGNA professional development activities during the school year. Principals and Supervisors were also included in the training.
e. Elementary Promotional Policy	The elementary promotional policy has been implemented.
f. High School Promotional Policy	The high school promotional policy has been implemented.
1.2.2 School Performance Targets	School-level performance targets for the school years 1997-98 through 1999-00 were established for Reading, Mathematics and Writing in benchmark grades of 4, 8 and 11. Target performance scores for 8 th and 11 th grade may be modified for 1998-99, based on the final standardized test scores for 1997-98. The requirement for a 4 th grade objective has been waived by the NJDOE for the 1998-99 school year, as districts transition to the ESPA and appropriate standards for that test are developed.
1.2.3 Support by Administrative Staff	
a. Classroom Observations by Principals	For the 1997-98 school year, the Superintendent set a target requiring each principal to complete 80 classroom observations. P.S. 20, 39 and 41, which changed principals mid year, met the prorated number of observations required. P.S. 12 did not complete observations due to long-term leave of the principal. All other principals met or exceeded that target with the exception of Snyder High School. Completed observation forms were submitted monthly to the Superintendent, with the Associates and Executive Assistant monitoring compliance in this area. Throughout the process, focus was maintained on improving instruction and holding principals accountable for quality instruction.

	ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
	b. School Visitations by Administrative/Supervisory Staff	As planned, Senior Administrative Staff, as well as Directors and Supervisors, scheduled and completed school visitations to observe staff and provide support and technical assistance in their area of expertise.
1.2.4	Staff Accountability	A draft teacher evaluation form has been prepared and, upon approval, will be in use to develop our teachers' Professional Improvement Plans for the 1998-99 school year. The new procedure calls for both formative and summative evaluations pursuant to NJAC 6:1.21. The formative observation will rate the teacher in four domains: Planning and Preparation; Students and Learning; Instruction; and, The Classroom Environment. As a summative measure, five domains will be assessed: Planning and Preparation; Students and Learning; Instruction; The Classroom Environment; and, Professional Attitudes and Manner.
1.2.5	Letters to Principals Regarding Performance	Individual letters were sent by the Superintendent to the Principal of each school on August 20, 1997, reviewing progress on student performance over the previous school year. Areas in need of improvement were emphasized. Similar letters are being developed for distribution in August, 1998.
1.2.6	Comprehensive School Assessment for SIGNA Schools	During the 1997-98 school year, the Comprehensive School Assessment procedure, designed to measure each school's progress in meeting the criteria for successful schools as outlined to the principals on August 20, 1997, has been completed in all district schools. P.S. 14, 12, 15, 9, 39, 20 and 41 have been assessed twice. A Senior Staff team conducted the CSA at each site, made its analysis, and provided building-specific recommendations for improvement. Following the CSA visit, a "Corrective Action Plan" was developed by the instructional leader in each school, with input from all staff and the Site Planning Team. Principals were then notified if their Corrective Action Plan was approved. Once the Plan was approved, the principal was responsible to submit a status report of progress within eight weeks.
1.3 Pr	ofessional Development	
1.3.1	Technology Training	Formal technology training was begun in November, 1997. To date, 1582 classroom teachers have been trained with anywhere from 3 to 30 hours of training. As well, 151 guidance counselors and school clerks have been trained on how to access student information from the district's AS 400. Site visits were performed with 221 teachers. Pool substitutes were hired to cover classes while training was in session, and two full-time trainers provided staff development at established school-based training sites.
1.3.2	Training for Early Childhood Accreditation	The district has contracted with Corn Associates and the National Association for Educating the Young Child (NAEYC) to provide training which will qualify the district to receive Early Childhood Accreditation. Training for this year has been concluded. All schools have begun their self-study, and will complete this task during the 1998-99 school year.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.3.3 Special Education Staff Training	The major staff development activity, to date, has been implementation of Project PROACT, a State grant which began in September, 1997, and runs through August 30, 1998. The program retrains school social workers to assume a supportive role for teachers of ED and MH students, as well as to develop individual behavior management programs and provide group and individual counseling sessions to those students. To date, six (6) training sessions (for a total of twenty-one [21] hours) were conducted for district social workers by professors from Rutgers University. An ancillary benefit of this grant was the funding of "token economies" by providing \$1,000 to each of thirty-one (31) of our special education classes. A continuation application for Phase 3 of Project PROACT has been submitted in the amount of \$70,000 for the period of September 1998 through August 1999. These monies will be used for additional training of our ED/MH teachers, for local field trips, and for purchase of therapeutic games for use with students. In addition, district-wide staff development has been provided in specific topics including The Role of the Special Education Teacher Aide, Collaborative Teaching, Dyslexia and Learning Disabilities, Preschool Inclusion, Hands-On Science, Social Development and Behavior, Adolescent Developmental Issues, and Review of the Special Education Manual and Code Issues. Each Child Study Team member was trained on the administration of the ESPA to special education students, including any necessary accommodations required for such administration. In September, we anticipate providing to our teachers training in dyslexia and the use of our new special education math series.
1.3.4 Professional Development Schools	To date, over one hundred fifty (150) visitations to the Professional Development Schools have taken place. Training for PDS Instructional Coaches is ongoing, and summer staff development for this group will be completed by July. These instructional coaches are now in the process of developing model professional portfolios for use with classroom teachers.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.3.5 Staff-Selected Training Opportunities	A Staff Development Needs Assessment was completed in June, 1997, and was used to plan and conduct 1997-98 staff development activities. Both the Teachers' and Administrators' Academies were held in August, 1997, as planned. Training of the Professional Development Corps (PDC) for the high schools took place during August, 1997. As well, a full range of staff development offerings were conducted in areas including Applied Technology/Life Skills, Bilingual/ESL, Early Childhood, Fine Arts, Guidance, Language Arts, Social Studies, Library Media, Math, Funded Programs, Performing Arts, Physical Education, PMP, Reading Recovery, Elementary Science, and Student Support Services. Graduate courses were offered every semester, in addition to after-school workshops.
	(Cont'd.)
1.3.5 Staff-Selected Training Opportunities (Cont'd.)	A Professional Development Program was designed and made available to all administrative staff. The Program was voluntary and was held from 3:30 p.m. to approximately 5:30 p.m. on scheduled dates. This professional institute included topics covering such issues as Curriculum Integration of Cognitive Theory and Neurological Research, Strategic Reading Instruction for Meeting the State Core Curriculum Content Standards, and The Principles of Constructivism and Active Learning. Also, the school district, in agreement with Liberty Science Center, provided professional development opportunities for our K-8 teachers. During the summer of 1998, planned summer staff development
	opportunities include New Teacher Orientation and the Teachers' and Administrators' Academies.
1.4 Expansion of Early Childhood Program	
1.4.1 Assignment of K-2 Teaching Assistants	All planned K-2 Teaching Assistant positions have been filled.
1.4.2 Full-Day Kindergarten Expansion	Seven full-day kindergarten classes have been established at the new P.S. #1. Five new full-day kindergartens will open in September, 1998, at P.S. #23.
1.4.3 Expansion of Reading Recovery Program	To date, fourteen (14) Reading Recovery teachers have been hired using Abbott funding and ten (10) using Title I funding for a total of twenty-four (24) additional positions.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.4.4 Increase Capacity of Facilities to Accommodate Expanded Programming	The district has purchased the former Lafayette Sign Building to renovate it for six (6) kindergarten and one (1) prekindergarten class. The facility will be known as #23 Annex. It will be occupied in September, and will provide P.S. 23 with a full-day kindergarten program. This is instead of the Marion Garden project.
	Balcony conversions at #5 and #22 are underway. Contracts have been awarded for the work to be done. Work will be completed by the end of the summer. Four (4) classrooms will be available to pupils beginning September, 1998.
	Additional improvements are being planned. Those improvements consist of classroom additions to the following schools for the purpose of reducing class size, accommodating early childhood and full-day kindergarten programs, and making each school handicapped accessible: School Nos. 6, 8, 34, and 39. In addition to the classroom addition to School No. 34, a media center and gymnasium will also be constructed.
	(Cont'd.)
1.4.4 Increase Capacity of Facilities to Accommodate Expanded Programming (Cont'd.)	The district is also planning improvements to the Henry Snyder High School. These improvements consist of renovations to the cafeteria as well as the construction of a technologically advanced media and television center for instructional purposes. There will also be a library added at P.S. #39. A total of thirty-four (34) classrooms will be added at these sites.
	The district is financing the Snyder improvements and modulars with a lease purchase agreement, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:20-4.2(f). The amount necessary to finance such improvements is approximately \$19.9 million. These projects will be completed during the 1998-99 school year, and all should be utilized by September of 1999.
1.5 Parent/Family/Community Initiatives	

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
1.5.1 Communications Plan	As one result of the formal Communications Audit, completed in September, 1997, a district-wide Communications Policy was developed, effective February 17, 1998 (S.O.P. #2.040). These guidelines conform to general practices followed by effective school districts when dealing with the media. They were designed to encourage collaboration and to meet the public's need for access to information about school operations and activities, as well as to ensure that the community receives complete and accurate information regarding the district.
	All schools and departments have been asked to contribute to a master calendar from the Superintendent's Office. Before scheduling any major events or activities, the Superintendent's Office must be notified so that the district calendar can be checked and/or cleared for scheduling.
	District publications include <i>Liberty Lines</i> , our informational newsletter; <i>The Communicator</i> , from our Department of Funded Programs; and, <i>Get On Board</i> , which summarizes all actions taken at each Board of Education Meeting, and is distributed throughout the district within 24 hours of the Board Meeting. Authorized spokespersons have been designated by the Superintendent to respond to inquiries from the media for specific issues affecting the district, or will locate other appropriate and responsible sources to respond.
1.5.2 Expansion of School-Level Parent Involvement Projects	Parent Grants—The district provided an opportunity for parent organizations and community groups to submit proposals for funding up to \$5,000. These grants were developed to support programs and activities to increase the level of parental involvement in the educational process. Forty-nine (49) grant awards representing thirty (30) schools and the Citywide Parents' Council were made. Over \$194,000 was awarded to these grant recipients.
1.5.3 Liberty Science Center Program	Field trips for all students in grades 2-8, district wide, and all high school science classes to visit Liberty Science Center have been concluded. Evaluation by student and teacher participants was conducted. For summer, 1998, Liberty Science Center Family Passes have been extended for use through August 31.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS	
1.5.4 District-Wide Parent Involvement Projects	A follow-up to our May, 1996, district wide <i>Parent Community Survey</i> was conducted to provide us with comparison data, as well as some indication as to how parental opinion regarding our schools may have changed over the past two years. The <i>Survey</i> was distributed in May, and is presently being scored. The first district-wide Parent Conference was held on November 25 at Jersey City State College. The Conference provided a full day of workshops for over five hundred (500) parent participants in over thirty (30) specific presentations by district staff. On May 27, 1998, the district hosted this year's second district-wide "Parents As Partners" Conference. The theme of this event, which was held again at Jersey City State College, was the "Spirit of Achievement." Any parent with a child enrolled in the Jersey City Schools or the Title I Non-Public Schools was invited to participate. Special arrangements were made to make it possible for all parents to attend, including free transportation from each public school, letters to employers requesting time off for parents to participate, Spanish language translators, etc. Over seven hundred fifty (750) parents were in attendance. All district-wide parent groups (Bilingual, PMP, Early Childhood, Joint Activities, Title I, etc.) continue to be operational for the current school year. In addition, a workshop for parents on Early Literacy was held on	
March 5, 1998.		
OBJECTIVE NO. 2: IMPROVE STUDENT	IATIENDANCE	
2.1 Enhanced Student Support System		
2.1.1 Individual School Student Attendance Targets	All schools with student attendance rates under 90 percent have developed objectives to meet or exceed State-mandated attendance levels. As well, the district has maintained monthly statistics to determine progress toward this objective on an interim basis. Attendance rates, by school and district, are presented in the data section of this report, which begin on page 9 of this document.	

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
2.1.2 Interagency Task Force Activities	Monthly meetings of the Interagency Task Force have continued. Hudson County has applied for the "One Easy Link Program," which links all community agencies with a computer network to integrate intake, service access, case management, and data gathering activities. The Interagency Task Force was presented with an overview of the system, and ongoing collaboration in this area is planned.
	In addition, the IATF has met with all Site Planning Teams in the district's schools. A subcommittee of the Board was established to facilitate this process and provide information regarding agency partnerships and how schools and students can access agency services. This program was presented on April 14.
	Several new committees have been established within the IATF, including the Zero Tolerance Committee, the Newsletter Committee, and the Comcast Cable Committee.
2.1.3 Student Referral System	The Horizon Health Center of Jersey City continued to be the service provider for the school-based health clinics throughout the 1997-98 school year. A meeting was held between the State Assistant Superintendent and Horizon Health Center staff in March to maintain ongoing communication regarding our school-based clinics. Guidance counselors have been advised of their role in making appropriate student referrals, thus enhancing services to all students requiring such services.
2.2 Violence/Vandalism/Conflict Resolution	student referrals, thus enhancing services to all students requiring such services.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
	Staff from the following schools received Social-Emotional Competencies/Conflict Resolution Training during the fall, 1997, semester. Elementary schools included P.S. Nos. 1, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, and The Academy. High schools included Dickinson, Ferris, Lincoln and Snyder. For the spring, 1998, semester, this partnership with Fairleigh Dickinson University continued with Conflict Resolution Training provided to P.S. Nos. 9, 17, 22, 39, 41 and Dickinson High School. A major focus of the second semester was to take the plans and recommendations developed during the first semester, and review and modify them for implementation, as appropriate, at the building level.
	The district developed and implemented a new "Zero Tolerance" Policy for weapons or violence in our schools, effective February 16, 1998, whereby any student who brings a weapon to school or commits acts of violence against any student or staff member is removed from the school building immediately for a minimum of ten (10) days. In some serious cases, the removal is for a minimum of one year and/or permanent expulsion from school. Short-term placement of students in violation of this policy is at two (Cont'd.)
	<u> </u>
	alternative sites: The Boys and Girls' Club of Jersey City (for students in grades 6-12) and P.S. #17 (for students in grades K-5). Zero Tolerance incidents addressed through June 19, 1998, total 128–including 45 high school incidents and 83 elementary school incidents.

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS		
	All DFSCA Program activities for the 1997-98 school year were conducted as planned. Student drug and alcohol screens have been conducted, and data has been maintained on the number of students referred and the determination of urine screens. During the 1995-96 school year, a total of 84 screens were conducted; during 1996-97, a total of 151 screens were conducted; and, for 1997-98, it is anticipated that in excess of 160 screens will be conducted.		
	In December, the district's 4 th , 6 th , 8 th , and 10 th graders participated in the American Drug, Alcohol and Tobacco Survey that was conducted by the Hudson County Department of Health and Human Services. Over the past two decades, the American Drug and Alcohol Survey has been used in numerous studies to measure student involvement with ten different drugs. The purpose of this survey was to collect data for the development of a plan by the Hudson County Department of Health and Human Services. This plan identifies the needs of the target populations; prioritizes the services to be provided; and allows for the effective allocation and distribution of resources and funding in the areas of substance abuse, tobacco and alcohol prevention activities and treatment services. The district participated in this survey as part of a coordinated planning effort to gather statistics and effectively use all our resources. "Project ABLE" presentations have been made as scheduled at the elementary schools. Sessions have also been held at each high school, as have meetings with peer leaders in those schools. Weekly meetings at the Giant Steps Program were held as planned.		
OBJECTIVE NO. 3: REDUCE STUDENT I	OBJECTIVE NO. 3: REDUCE STUDENT DROPOUT RATE		
3.1 Dropout Prevention Initiative			
3.1.1 Dropout Tracking System and 3.1.2 Dropout Task Force	The Dropout Task Force issued its final report on December 15, 1997. The major finding was that overall data collection procedures have been unreliable and that there is an absolute need for clear guidelines to be applied across the district when defining a dropout. A full range of recommendations for the district and school level were made, and a tracking system to be utilized by school-level guidance counselors was		
	(Cont'd.)		

ACTIVITIES	SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF PROGRESS
3.1.1 Dropout Tracking System and3.1.2 Dropout Task Force (Cont'd.)	implemented. This summer, over 350 students are attending a 6-week project-based summer school program. Each group of 15-18 students has a Counselor/Mentor and a Peer Counselor that will remain with them in their high school throughout the school year.
	This tracking system was overseen directly by the Superintendent of Schools who reviewed each guidance counselor's submission of the Student Dropout Form Monthly Report. That form consists of information including student name, ID number, grade level, date last attended school, date removed from register, record of exit conference held with parent and student, reason for dropping out, and actions taken by counselor to prevent dropping out. Each individual case was reviewed and verified, and appropriate follow-up, when indicated, was begun. Monthly statistics on dropouts were collected. The full text of the Dropout Task Force report is available for review.
3.1.3 Alternative Education	District alternative education programs and strategies are being continued during the current school year. These programs include BRIDGES, VOYAGES, Kenmare Alternative High School, and a "Skills Arts" After-School Program for Homeless Students. This fall, Academy II, an alternative middle school, will be implemented for those 6 th , 7 th , and 8 th grade students who have difficulty adjusting to the general school setting.
3.1.4 School-to-Work Opportunities Program	To date, all program plan activities of our 1997-98 School-to-Work Opportunities Initiative have been accomplished per project timelines, and interim reports have been sent to the NJDOE to verify our progress. These interim reports for the first and second reporting periods are available for review from the district's EBA Department. Final reports will be forwarded to the NJDOE in August and September, 1998, which will complete the reporting requirements for the current school year.

